

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MATT RADDUE, individually; JACK DIEP, individually, JORY LEVY, individually; CARLOS MAURICIO GIL, individually; JAMES DAYAP, individually,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LIBERTY MEDIA CORPORATION d/b/a FORMULA ONE HEINKEN SILVER LAS VEGAS GRAND PRIX, a foreign corporation; LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION, a domestic corporation; DOE INDIVIDUALS 1-20, inclusive; and ROE CORPORATIONS 1-20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-02124-GMN-NJK

**ORDER
EXTENDING TIME FOR
DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND TO
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT OR
CONSOLIDATED AMENDED
COMPLAINT
(Second Request)**

1 Pursuant to Local Rule IA 6-1, 6-2 and LR 7-1, the undersigned counsel of record for Plaintiffs,
2 Defendant Liberty Media Corporation (“Liberty”), and Defendant Las Vegas Paving Corporation (“Las
3 Vegas Paving”) hereby STIPULATE to extend the time for Defendants to answer or move in response to
4 the Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) or any consolidated amended complaint that may be
5 forthcoming, as explained below. Per Plaintiffs’ and Liberty’s first stipulation and the Court’s order dated
6 January 2, 2024, Liberty’s response to the FAC is currently due January 12, 2024. *See* ECF Nos. 8-10.
7 Per Plaintiffs’ and Las Vegas Paving’s first stipulation and the Court’s order dated January 8, 2024, Las
8 Vegas Paving’s response to the FAC is likewise due January 12, 2024. *See* ECF Nos. 11, 14.

9
10 The reason for the requested extension is that Liberty removed a related case from state court to
11 this Court on January 5, 2024. *See Cutchins, et al. v. Liberty Media Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 2:24-
12 cv-00048-APG-EJY. Liberty filed a notice of related cases in both actions on January 5, 2024, *see*
13 *Raddue*, ECF No. 13; *Cutchins* ECF No. 7, wherein it advised of the potential the cases could be
14 consolidated. On January 8, 2024, counsel for Liberty and Plaintiffs met and conferred regarding these
15 developments. Plaintiffs’ counsel advised they intend to file a motion to consolidate this action with
16 *Cutchins* forthwith. Undersigned counsel for Defendants have advised they will not oppose the motion
17 as they agree the cases should be consolidated before this Court. Given the likelihood of consolidation
18 and the filing of a consolidated amended complaint thereafter, the parties agree it would be in the interest
19 of judicial economy to defer Defendants’ deadline to answer or move until 14 days after a consolidated
20 amended complaint is filed or after the motion to consolidate is denied, in which case Defendants will
21 answer or move in response to the FAC.
22
23

